



TITLE:

# On the probabilities associated with unitary matrices(The 7th Workshop on Stochastic Numerics)

AUTHOR(S):

Takahashi, Y.

---

CITATION:

Takahashi, Y.. On the probabilities associated with unitary matrices(The 7th Workshop on Stochastic Numerics). 数理解析研究所講究録 2006, 1462: 217-223

ISSUE DATE:

2006-01

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/47983>

RIGHT:

# On the probabilities associated with unitary matrices

Y. Takahashi  
RIMS, Kyoto University

## 1 Background

The series of joint works with T. Shirai on fermion point processes, boson point processes and others strongly suggested the following.

**Theorem 1.** *For a given unitary matrix  $U = (u_{ij})_{1 \leq j, k \leq n}$  there exists a probability  $p$  on the symmetric group  $S_n$  such that*

$$|\det U_{AB}|^2 = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n, \sigma(A)=B} p(\sigma) \quad (A, B \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}).$$

where  $U_{AB} = (u_{jk})_{j \in A, k \in B}$  and we set  $\det U_{AB} = 0$  unless  $|A| \neq |B|$ .

This result sharpens the following well-known theorem which shows the existence of an *i.i.d* sequence of permutations that drives a given symmetric Markov chain.

**Theorem 2.** *A doubly stochastic matrix  $P = (p_{jk})$ ,  $\sum_k p_{jk} = \sum_k p_{kj} = 1$  is a convex combination of representation matrices of permutations,  $E_\sigma = (\delta(k = \sigma(j)))_{1 \leq j, k \leq n}$ .*

The proof of Theorem 1 will be published elsewhere. Here we discuss the uniqueness problem for  $|\det U_{AB}|^2$  appearing in the L.H.S. of the assertion.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $X, Y$  be matrices of the same type and assume*

$$\det(I + X^* S X T) = \det(I + Y^* S Y T)$$

*for any diagonal matrices  $S$  and  $T$ .*

Then there exist unitary diagonal matrices  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  such that

$$Y = D_1^* X D_2 \quad \text{or} \quad Y = D_1^* \bar{X} D_2$$

where  $\bar{X}$  stands for the component-wise complex conjugate of  $X$ .

It is obvious that the converse of Theorem 3 holds. The determinant  $\det(I + X^* S X T)$  is a generating function in components of  $S$  and  $T$  with coefficients  $|\det X_{AB}|^2$ . Consequently, it solves the uniqueness problem stated above.

By the way, such a kind of uniqueness problem is not so simple in general. For instance, we have the following

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be hermitian matrices and assume*

$$\det(I + XT) = \det(I + YT)$$

*for any diagonal matrix  $T$ .*

*Then, "generically", there exists a unitary diagonal matrix  $D$  such that  $Y = D^* X D$  or  $Y = D^* \bar{X} D$  but there exist counter-examples if the size  $n \geq 4$ .*

In deed, the "canonical form" of counter-examples for  $n = 4$  is as follows. Consider

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12}e^{i\delta\alpha} & c_{13} & c_{14} \\ c_{21}e^{-i\delta\alpha} & c_{22} & c_{23} & c_{24} \\ c_{31} & c_{32} & c_{33} & c_{34}e^{i\epsilon\beta} \\ c_{41} & c_{42} & c_{43}e^{-i\epsilon\beta} & c_{44} \end{bmatrix}.$$

where  $c_{jk} \geq 0$ ,  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ . If we choose distinct pairs of  $\delta, \epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$  for  $X$  and  $Y$ , we can find a counter-example.

## 2 The proof of Theorem 3

We employ the following notations for matrices  $X = (x_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq n}$  and  $Y = (y_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq n}$  with  $x_{jk} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $y_{jk} \in \mathbb{C}$ :

(a)  $\bar{X} = (\bar{x}_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq k \leq n}$ .

(b)  $X \approx Y$  if for any  $p = 1, 2, \dots, \min\{m, n\}$  and for any  $j_1 < \dots < j_p$  and  $k_1 < \dots < k_p$

$$|\det(y_{j_r k_s})_{1 \leq r, s \leq p}| = |\det(x_{j_r k_s})_{1 \leq r, s \leq p}|.$$

- (c)  $X \sim Y$  if there exist  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m, \varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_m \in \mathbb{R}$  (precisely,  $\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$ ) such that

$$y_{jk} = e^{i(\theta_j - \varphi_k)} x_{j,k}$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and all  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .

Moreover we write

$$X \overset{\pm}{\sim} Y \quad \text{if} \quad X \sim Y \quad \text{and} \quad X \overset{\sim}{\sim} Y \quad \text{if} \quad \overline{X} \sim Y.$$

Under above notations the statement of Theorem can be restated as follows:

$$\text{if } X \approx Y, \quad \text{then } X \overset{\pm}{\sim} Y \quad \text{or} \quad X \overset{\sim}{\sim} Y.$$

## 2.1 Preliminary

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $a, b, \theta, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}$  and assume*

$$|e^{i\theta}a - b| = |e^{i\varphi}a - b|.$$

*Then one of the following holds:*

$$(a) \ a = 0 \quad (b) \ b = 0 \quad (c) \ \theta = \varphi \pmod{2\pi} \quad (d) \ \theta = -\varphi \pmod{2\pi}.$$

*Conversely, if one of (a)-(d) holds then  $|e^{i\theta}a - b| = |e^{i\varphi}a - b|$ .*

*Proof.* The cases (a) and (b) are trivial. Assume  $a \neq 0$  and  $b \neq 0$ . Then  $|z - b| = r$  and  $|z| = |a|$  are two distinct circles on the complex plane which are symmetric with respect to the real axis. Hence they intersect at most two points which are complex conjugate.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $U_{jk} \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $j, k = 1, 2$ . Then the identity*

$$U_{11} + U_{22} = U_{12} + U_{21}$$

*holds if and only if there exist  $v_1, v_2, w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{C}$  such that*

$$u_{jk} = v_j - w_k.$$

*Proof.* The "if" part is obvious. To prove the "only if" part set

$$\begin{aligned} U_{11} + U_{22} &= U_{12} + U_{21} = s, \\ U_{21} - U_{11} &= U_{22} - U_{12} = a, \\ U_{12} - U_{11} &= U_{22} - U_{21} = b \end{aligned}$$

and

$$v_1 = \frac{s-a}{2}, v_2 = \frac{s+a}{2}, w_1 = \frac{b}{2}, w_2 = -\frac{b}{2}.$$

Then

$$u_{jk} = v_j - w_k \quad \text{for } j, k = 1, 2.$$

**Lemma 3.** Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be matrices of type  $(m, n)$  and set

$$\begin{aligned} X' &= (x_{jk})_{l \leq j \leq m, l \leq k \leq n-1}, & X'' &= (x_{jk})_{l \leq j \leq m, 2 \leq k \leq n}, \\ Y' &= (y_{jk})_{l \leq j \leq m, l \leq k \leq n-1}, & Y'' &= (y_{jk})_{l \leq j \leq m, 2 \leq k \leq n}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that

$$X' \sim Y' \quad \text{and} \quad X'' \sim Y''.$$

In addition, assume that  $x_{jk} \neq 0$  for some  $j$  and  $k$  with  $1 \leq j \leq m$  and  $2 \leq k \leq n-1$ . Then

$$X \sim Y.$$

*Proof.* By the assumption there exist  $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_m, \varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_{n-1}$  and  $\theta''_1, \dots, \theta''_m, \varphi''_2, \dots, \varphi''_n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} y_{jk} &= e^{i(\theta'_j - \varphi'_k)} x_{jk} \quad \text{for } l \leq j \leq m \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ y_{jk} &= e^{i(\theta''_j - \varphi''_k)} x_{jk} \quad \text{for } l \leq j \leq m \quad \text{and} \quad 2 \leq k \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the additional assumption  $x_{jk} \neq 0$  and  $y_{jk} \neq 0$  for some  $j$  and  $k$  with  $l \leq j \leq m$  and  $2 \leq k \leq n-1$ . Hence

$$\theta'_j - \varphi'_k = \theta''_j - \varphi''_k \quad \text{or} \quad \theta'_j - \theta''_j = \varphi''_k - \varphi'_k = \alpha$$

for such  $(j, k)$ . Consequently,

$$y_{jk} = e^{i(\theta_j - \varphi_k)} x_{jk} \quad \text{for } l \leq j \leq m \quad \text{and} \quad l \leq k \leq n$$

with  $\theta_j = \theta'_j$  ( $l \leq j \leq m$ ),  $\varphi_k = \varphi'_k$  ( $l \leq k \leq n-1$ ) and  $\varphi_n = \theta''_n + \alpha$ .

## 2.2 Proof of Theorem 3

Step 1:  $m = n = 2$ .

Let  $X = (x_{jk})_{1 \leq j,k \leq 2}$  and  $Y = (y_{jk})_{1 \leq j,k \leq 2}$ . Since  $X \approx Y$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |x_{jk}| &= |y_{jk}| \quad (j, k = 1, 2) \quad \text{and} \\ |x_{11}x_{22} - x_{12}x_{21}| &= |y_{11}y_{22} - y_{12}y_{21}|. \end{aligned}$$

Set  $x_{jk} = c_{jm}e^{i\xi_{jk}}$  and  $y_{jk} = c_{jk}e^{i\eta_{jk}}$  where  $c_{jk} = |x_{jk}|$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &|e^{i(\xi_{11}+\xi_{22}-\xi_{12}-\xi_{21})}c_{11}c_{22} - c_{12}c_{21}| \\ &= |e^{i(\eta_{11}+\eta_{22}-\eta_{12}-\eta_{21})}c_{11}c_{22} - c_{12}c_{21}|. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1, it follows either  $c_{11}c_{22}c_{12}c_{21} = 0$  or

$$\eta_{11} + \eta_{22} - \eta_{12} - \eta_{21} = \pm(\xi_{11} + \xi_{22} - \xi_{12} - \xi_{21}).$$

In the latter case, by Lemma 2 there exist  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  such that

$$\eta_{jk} \mp \xi_{jk} = \theta_j - \varphi_k, \quad j, k = 1, 2.$$

Hence

$$Y \sim X \quad \text{or} \quad Y \sim \bar{X}$$

according to the sign  $\mp$ .

If  $c_{11}c_{22}c_{12}c_{21} = 0$ ,  $X$  is one of the following form

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad &\begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{12} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} \end{pmatrix}, x_{12}x_{21}x_{22} \neq 0 & (a') \quad &\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ x_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, x_{11}x_{12}x_{21} \neq 0 \\ (b) \quad &\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & 0 \\ x_{21} & x_{22} \end{pmatrix}, x_{11}x_{21}x_{22} \neq 0 & (b') \quad &\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ 0 & x_{22} \end{pmatrix}, x_{11}x_{12}x_{22} \neq 0 \\ (c) \quad &\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & 0 \\ x_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix} & (c') \quad &\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ (c'') \quad &\begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_{11} \\ 0 & x_{21} \end{pmatrix} & (c''') \quad &\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x_{21} & x_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

In case (a), setting  $\varphi_1 = 0, \theta_1 = \eta_{11} - \xi_{11}, \theta_2 = \eta_{21} - \xi_{21}$  and  $\varphi_2 = \eta_{22} - \xi_{22} - \theta_2$  one finds  $\eta_{jk} = \xi_{jk} + \theta_j - \varphi_k$ .

In case (b), setting  $\theta_2 = 0, \varphi_1 = \xi_{21} - \eta_{21}, \varphi_2 = \xi_{22} - \eta_{22}$  and  $\theta_1 = \eta_{12} - \xi_{12} + \varphi_2$  one finds  $\eta_{jk} = \xi_{jk} + \theta_j - \varphi_k$ .

In these cases, it is easy to find  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  such that

$$y_{jk} = e^{i(\theta_j - \varphi_k)} x_{jk} \quad \text{for } j, k = 1, 2.$$

For instance,

case(a):  $\varphi_1 = 0, \theta_1 = \eta_{11} - \xi_{11}, \theta_2 = \eta_{21} - \xi_{21}$  and  $\varphi_2 = \eta_{22} - \xi_{22} - \theta_2$ .

case(b):  $\theta_2 = 0, \varphi_1 = \xi_{21} - \eta_{21}, \varphi_2 = \xi_{22} - \eta_{22}$  and  $\theta_1 = \eta_{12} - \xi_{12} + \varphi_2$ .

Consequently, in these degenerated cases we obtain

$$Y \sim X.$$

□

**Step 2:**  $m = 2, n = 3$ .

Let  $X = (x_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq k \leq 3}$  and  $Y = (y_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq k \leq 3}$  and define

$$\begin{aligned} X' &= (x_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq 2, 1 \leq k \leq 2}, & X'' &= (x_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq 2, 2 \leq k \leq 3}, \\ X''' &= (x_{jk})_{1 \leq j \leq 2, k \in \{1, 3\}} \end{aligned}$$

and  $Y', Y'', Y'''$  in a similar manner. Since  $X \approx Y$  implies  $X' \approx Y', X'' \approx Y'', X''' \approx Y'''$  it follows from Step 1 that

$$X' \stackrel{\varepsilon'}{\sim} Y', X'' \stackrel{\varepsilon''}{\sim} Y'', X''' \stackrel{\varepsilon'''}{\sim} Y'''$$

for some  $\varepsilon', \varepsilon'', \varepsilon''' \in \{\pm 1\}$ . Then at least two of  $\varepsilon', \varepsilon''$  and  $\varepsilon'''$  coincide. For simplicity, assume  $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon'' = +$ . Then

$$X' \approx Y' \quad \text{and} \quad X'' \approx Y''.$$

By Lemma 3 one can conclude  $X \sim Y$  if  $x_{12} \neq 0$  or  $x_{22} \neq 0$ . If  $x_{12} = x_{22} = 0$ , then relation  $X''' \stackrel{\varepsilon'''}{\sim} Y'''$  is equivalent to the relation  $X \stackrel{\varepsilon'''}{\sim} Y$ .

**Step 3:**  $m = 2, n \geq 4$ .

We appeal to the induction on  $n$ . In Step 2 we proved the assertion for  $n = 3$ . Let us assume we have proved for  $n - 1$  and show the case for  $n$ .

If  $X$  and  $Y$  are matrices of type  $(2, n)$  and  $X \approx Y$ , then we have  $n$  submatrices  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  of  $X$  and  $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$  of  $Y$  of type  $(2, n - 1)$ .

By induction assumption, we have  $X_i \overset{\varepsilon_i}{\sim} Y_i$  for each  $i$  with  $\varepsilon_i = \pm$ . Since  $n \geq 4$ , we can find at least two  $i$ 's for which  $\varepsilon_i$ 's coincide with each other. Thus, a similar argument to Step 2 shows that  $X \overset{\pm}{\sim} Y$  or  $X \sim Y$ .

**Step 4:**  $m \geq 3, n \geq 3$ .

We appeal to the induction on  $m$  fixing  $n$ .

Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be matrices of type  $(m, n)$  and  $X \approx Y$ . Then we can find at least two par submatrices  $X', X'', Y', Y''$  of type  $(m-1, n)$  and  $\varepsilon \in \{\pm\}$  such that

$$X' \overset{\varepsilon}{\sim} Y' \quad \text{and} \quad X'' \overset{\varepsilon}{\sim} Y''.$$

By Lemma 3 if  $X'$  and  $X''$  have a common nonzero entry, we have  $X \overset{\varepsilon}{\sim} Y$ . If they have no common nonzero entries, then  $X$  and  $Y$  are essentially of type  $(2, n)$ . Hence by Step 3 we obtain  $X \overset{\pm}{\sim} Y$  or  $X \sim Y$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] Random point fields associated with certain Fredholm determinants I: fermion, Poisson and boson point processes, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **205** (2003), 414-463. (with T. Shirai)
- [2] Random point fields associated with certain Fredholm determinants II: fermion shifts and their ergodic properties, *Ann. Prob.*, **31** (2003), 1533-1564. (with T. Shirai)
- [3] Random point fields associated with fermion, boson and other statistics, in *Stochastic analysis on large scale interacting systems*, 345-354, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., **39**, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2004. (with T. Shirai)